

Christian Order

Summary of Contents for April, 1965

A DAY TO REMEMBER	<i>The Editor</i>
NORTH VIETNAM AFTER TEN YEARS	<i>P. J. Honey</i>
POVERTY TO-DAY	<i>J. M. Jackson</i>
MISSIONARY CHURCH	<i>Vincent Rochford</i>
ABSTRACTIONS AND OURSELVES	<i>The Editor</i>
LEARNING FROM THE COMMUNISTS	<i>Douglas Hyde</i>

Contents

Page

193 ABSTRACTIONS AND OURSELVES
The Editor

195 THE CHRISTIAN LIFE:
MISSIONARY CHURCH
Vincent Rochford

199 CURRENT COMMENT
A DAY TO REMEMBER
The Editor

211 MONTHLY REPORT:
NORTH VIETNAM AFTER TEN
YEARS
P. J. Honey

222 POVERTY REPORT
J. M. Jackson

230 ANY QUESTIONS?
William Lawson, S.J.

234 LEARNING FROM THE COMMUNISTS
—2
Douglas Hyde

253 BOOK REVIEW
Paul Crane, S.J.

IF YOU CHANGE YOUR ADDRESS:

If you are planning to change your address please let us know at least two or three weeks ahead because subscription lists are made up in advance. Send us both new and old addresses.

CHRISTIAN ORDER is a monthly magazine devoted to the promulgation of Catholic Social Teaching and incisive comment on current affairs. It is published for Father Paul Crane, S.J., 65 Belgrave Road, London SW1, by C. J. Fallon (London) Ltd., 1 Furnival St., London EC4 and 31 King St., Belfast 1, and printed in the Republic of Ireland by The Record Press Ltd., Brighton Terrace, Bray.

Annual subscription: one year, fifteen shillings; in the U.S.A. and Canada three dollars; in Australia twenty-one shillings; postage paid.

Those who till now have bought Christian Order each month at their church door or elsewhere are advised that the magazine is obtainable by subscription only. The rate is 15/- per annum. Send your subscription please to:

C. J. Fallon Ltd.,
43 Parkgate Street,
Dublin 8, Ireland.

Christian Order

EDITED BY

Paul Crane SJ

VOLUME 6.

APRIL, 1965

NUMBER 4.

Abstractions and Ourselves

THE EDITOR

A GOOD many of us spend a good deal of our time hiding behind abstractions. It is a way, I suppose, of escaping responsibility. I am not suggesting that this is done deliberately. The process, for most, is subconscious, something to which we have long grown accustomed..

What I mean is that we have brought ourselves up to endow institutions with personality; to think of them, somehow, as possessed of a life of their own that is separate from the life of their members. This is not so, of course, except in a juridical sense. Nevertheless, we continue to act in ordinary life as if it were. It has become the habit of many of us to step aside from an organisation to which we may belong, to endow it with a life it does not possess and expect it then to do, apart from its members, a job, of which, as an abstract entity, it is entirely incapable. A country, like an organisation, is no better than its members. No organisation goes to the dogs; no more does a country. As abstract entities they are incapable of going anywhere on their own. It is the citizens of one and the members of the other who are responsible ultimately for the road they take. England is not something out on its own, enjoying a separate existence. England is the English people. Its health is their health. The two cannot be separated, except in the mind. We tend to do just this

and then go on to give concrete form and shape to our mental concept. Our next step is to endow it with life and place on its shoulders responsibilities which should be ours. What's wrong with the country, we ask. The question is ludicrous. What we should be asking is what is wrong with ourselves.

At this point, however, something else besides fear of involvement comes to dissuade us. Each conceives his area of action wrongly and tends to see the task confronting him in unreal and outsize terms. Increased centralisation of government has left us with the feeling that change can only be wrought from above. Growing depersonalisation of the country's administrative apparatus has left us with the thought that individual effort is irrelevant in this context. We ask how we, as individuals, can carry through that which we think of as properly the work of a centralised and impersonal bureaucracy. The answer is that it isn't. The problem is wrongly conceived. A country, I have said, is no better than its people. Administrations, as such, cannot make people better. This, under God, people can only do to themselves and to those immediately about them in the circle of their workaday lives. The task, then, of the individual Englishman stands defined as that of beginning with himself and those about him. Declarations of intent get us nowhere in this context; no more does a technological revolution. These, too, are abstractions, meaningless without the human beings—ourselves—who are partners to them. To endow them with top priority as instruments of national salvation is merely to place before us, who must be the main characters in the drama, another opportunity of evading responsibilities which, in the very nature of things, can only belong to ourselves.

It is a matter, then, of each man to his last. The effect, if only a few assumed their responsibilities, would be quite remarkable. Their example, I believe, would prove infectious. The intensified pursuit and upholding of that which is right and good is the first priority which each who cares should lay upon himself without delay.

THE CHRISTIAN LIFE

Because the Church may never disinterest itself in the salvation of any man it is by nature a missionary Church. And in our pluralist society where so few are practising Christians the challenge to us to become the new leaven grows ever more urgent.

Missionary Church

VINCENT ROCHFORD

FOREIGN Missions . . . The words conjure up in our minds a picture of a white priest driving his jeep along a jungle path, beginning a safari. And we know there is a "Second Collection" every year in our church.

Perhaps our picture is a little out of date? The Church in Africa needs outside help indeed: priests, sisters, doctors, nurses, teachers, engineers and mechanics, and, inevitably, money. But such needs do not make a Church missionary. We ourselves need the help of foreign clergy, nuns and teachers: where would we be save for Ireland's help? But that does not make the English Church a foreign mission!

In fact the African Church is staffed more and more by bishops and priests of their own blood. And as their countries gain control of their political destinies, and resentment against the white man flares up so easily, if the African Church wore a European countenance, it would spell frustration and danger.

The Church in Africa, in fact, resents the title of "Foreign Mission". It claims to be the Church of Africa, equal with the Church of England, of France, of the Netherlands.

Besides being the Church of Africa, it claims to be missionary itself. Like any other Church. For the Catholic Church is always a missionary Church. To be missionary

is part of its very definition. If it ceased to be missionary it would cease to be Catholic. It would be retiring within itself, going back on the mission given to it by Jesus Christ. It may never disinterest itself in the saving of any man nor any group nor any social institution.

The whole Church must be apostolic and each local Church must be missionary also.

Mission-consciousness Varies

Accidents of historical and geographical situation have caused ebb and flow in the Church's missionary effort. In the early centuries her missionary impetus was unflagging. From the Acts of the Apostles to the work of Cyril and Methodius among the Slavs in the tenth century the story was the same: Augustine, Patrick, Columcille, Boniface are merely names with which we are familiar, but there were thousands of others, the effort to penetrate the outlying pagan societies was unceasing.

But as the Dark Ages came to a close and feudal society brought more stability to Europe, the Church was concentrating her activity on building a society informed by Christian values. She was struggling to temper rulership by the idea of stewardship, to subject buying and selling to justice between man and man, to win status for the apprentice and journeyman, to keep culture alive through religious orders and universities, and above all set the spiritual order free from lay control.

Slowly, then, the missionary idea faded from her pre-occupations. Europe was the Faith—but the Faith was Europe. Outside, across the seas, lay the great wastes of paganism, to the South the fanatical Moslems; inside Europe Christendom was being built—and that was all that mattered. In any case travel was hazardous, maps few and forbidding, the cartography based on Marco Polo showed whole areas inhabited by fierce beasts rather than by men.

It was the Spanish conquests that brought the problem of the infidel into focus as accessible material for apostolic endeavour and much of South America was baptised, even

if any deep formation hardly existed. But the Church had rediscovered her missionary nature, and the Counter-Reform set out to win in the East the masses that had been lost in Northern Europe. Heroic pioneers like Xavier, Ricci and de Nobili reached India, Japan, China.

Henceforth this effort to penetrate the infidel lands never ceased, the colonising by European powers during the last century opened up a continent, but opened minds as well. All Christian communions realised that lands open to trade and national flags lay open to missionary endeavour too, and the process of infiltration, often by incredible courage and sacrifice, went on apace.

A new understanding followed. It was realised that inveigling vast numbers to accept baptism was not the objective of the missions, but the implanting of the Church, its striking roots in a territory and culture was the true objective. And part of this ideal is the formation, in spite of the difficulties, of a native clergy and hierarchy.

It is only in our days that we are even realising the problem perceived by early Jesuit missionaries of adaptation; how the Faith is so bound up with European modes of thought and expression that it needs complete rethinking, so that the body of Christ may wear the dress of other cultures whilst retaining its true nature. For actions and symbols which speak to the Western mind through long tradition may bring quite a different message to the Oriental or African.

Home Mission

In the last half-century our thinking has gone further. We have realised that we who send our missionaries abroad are largely in a missionary situation ourselves!

For centuries every child born in Europe (unless he were a Jew) was "born" a Catholic, in the sense that he would automatically receive baptism and be counted a member of the Church.

After the Reformation, the prince chose his subjects' religion. A child born in one principality would almost certainly be Catholic; had he been born fifty or a hundred miles away he would equally surely be Protestant. And

society would be informed, at any rate nominally, with the Catholic or Protestant thinking. His neighbours, the local minister, the public authority and the institutions of his society would be inspired with its appropriate ethos. The whole climate of his life, all the influences he underwent, would reflect it; he would know that some ignorant if not wicked folk, "the other side", lived in great numbers a distance away. Thus he would grow up and live his life at any rate juridically a Catholic or a Protestant.

Such an atmosphere has unlimited power—so long as one remains in it. There are a tiny number of countries even to-day where it would be impossible to grow up anything but Catholic, at least superficially.

The number is tiny; and owing to modern communications and travel it must diminish. And the rest? France is thought of as a "Catholic country", although its own priests recognise that it is dechristianised. England is a "Christian country": but in what sense? It is not Moslem nor Buddhist, the ideas its people value are still, though to a decreasing extent, of Christian origin.

Many of its people are avowedly non-Christians, especially the "intellectuals". The mass of the population is increasingly ignorant of the basic facts of salvation history, of Jesus Christ, even of God himself, more and more a shadowy, distant figure, an inflated Father Christmas. Our social structures are "good pagan", they take no account of Christian teachings. The consequence is that a child who grows up without strong family backing will not be likely to be a believing Christian. The whole social climate will be against him.

In fact England is a missionary country!

Countries once Catholic, either in fact or only in theory, are almost a thing of the past. What the French were the first to perceive about their own country is true of almost every other, even if others are less quick to notice the fact. Everywhere the Church lives in a pluralist society; and this means the whole Church everywhere must become a missionary Church. As the situation changes, the Church comes to understand her nature and mission more deeply.

CURRENT COMMENT

For a few hours, on the day of Churchill's funeral, values were shared by the watching crowds which are, at one and the same time, the stuff of patriotism and the condition of national recovery. The implications are important. The Editor examines them.

A Day to Remember

THE EDITOR

WE did not bury England on that grey, cold day at the end of January, which none who were there will ever forget. We buried Winston Churchill. The point is worth making. Too many commentators spoke and wrote as if this were the end not only of the great man who saved us all, but of the people he saved. Churchill would be the first to repudiate such an implication. For him, England was never done for. He saw the reserves that were hers in a crisis. His genius lay in his supreme ability to tap them, to educe in phrases that will never be forgotten the pent-up courage of an island race, to personify in himself the virtues that were their heritage. Churchill knew what could be expected from his countrymen. They knew that he knew. Their response to his supreme confidence in them could only be unbounded. Had he nudged them feebly towards the second-rate or fretted fearfully over their security, the English would never have survived the dark days of 1940. Instead, they turned them to glory. It was precisely because he called them to the heights that they rode the storm triumphantly. Without the sturdy courage of his people Churchill knew he was helpless. His genius centered on his recognition of this fact. He was the first to proclaim it. He manufactured nothing. He played superbly on what was there. What was there remains, even though the great man is dead. England

made Winston Churchill. He did not make England. He would want the thought to stay with us, now that he has gone. The qualities he embodied so magnificently are still with us. We need to use them again. Our best memorial to Winston Churchill is not in stone or scholarship. It lies in a renewed quality of national life.

Virtue Comes Again

Interestingly enough—and very movingly—the process of renewal began on the day we buried Sir Winston. The foundation was there. What I mean is that, on this occasion, there were in evidence, as they have not been for some time, virtues whose restoration is essential to the future health of this nation. Their appearance on the kerbside was what one noticed most about the massed thousands who came to speed the greatest of Englishmen on this his last journey.

Outstanding was the quiet pride—in him and in ourselves—that was evidenced everywhere. We were alone, once again, as we were in 1940. Others had come to pay homage to the great man, who had saved their people as well as his own. We welcomed them, but this, emphatically, was our affair. Our pride was in our country whose stock of virtue had produced such a man. We saluted England as we saluted Sir Winston on his way—for having reproduced in himself so much that is good in our land. Pride in him and in ourselves, for he was part of us, and in our English heritage. This was patriotism at its best. Its dignified upsurge on that biting cold January day was the more remarkable in view of the insidious efforts made by little-minded men to discredit it over the years. The scribblers have been busy since the war tearing cheaply at our heritage, sneering and pulling down. They have sought meanly to destroy in order to elevate themselves. The implication of all they say and do has been that England's future can only be built on a denial of her past. The disavowal of our heritage is proclaimed as a sole condition of future progress. Contentment with the second-rate is held out as the only valid passport to national

security. This onslaught has left us bewildered, without poise, no longer sure of ourselves.

Churchill the Patriot

We know in our hearts, however, that what the scribblers say is untrue. A nation's future is conditioned by its history; the dynamic of its advance measured by the extent to which quiet pride in past achievement endows it with the poise necessary to shape and fashion its future. This is what Churchill saw so well. It was this that made him so great a patriot, for patriotism, predominantly, is the virtue that makes a man strive to be worthy of the best in his country's heritage, and this is what Churchill always did. It was his patriotism which seeped through the crowds that January day to give them, once again that confidence in themselves as a people, that pride in their country's past, which is the condition of future greatness. Silenced then were the mean and spiteful voices of the last twenty years. For a few hours, at least, we saw straight again. We were at one with ourselves. Unity was in the shape of a recognition, clearly perceived by some, but present, at least subconsciously, in all, of the enduring worth of values which Churchill drew, under God, from the bone and marrow of England. The old man was no saint. Neither was the young man. It would be foolish and hypocritical to try and make him so. All I am saying here is that he stood for certain things, which have been of supreme importance in the texture of England's past and on which alone its future greatness can be built. It is the mark of a true patriot, one who loves his country, to incorporate them into his living. This is precisely what Churchill did. This is what we mean by dedication to a national ideal; not the passive following of a path indicated as desirable by national leaders, but the active, yet quiet upholding and embodiment in our lives of values recognised as essential to our own and, therefore, our country's life. England, after all, is not an abstraction. England is ourselves. She collapses if we do and that must be our fate if the values traditional to past greatness no longer find currency in our lives. An

active assertion of such values is the condition now of national recovery. Not exhortation from above, but dedication from within.

Loyalty and Manners

One noticed, once again, the quiet reassertion of these values at Sir Winston's funeral. It was as if, by common and implied consent, we used the occasion for a profession of faith in what we had always really believed, but grown over self-conscious about expressing in public. At the funeral, for example, there was loyalty that was unself-conscious and unashamed. I watched the procession go by from an office window in the Strand. Afterwards, we went, like many others, to see the rest on TV. When, at the end of the service in St. Paul's, the National Anthem was played, the viewers stood up quite spontaneously. They remained standing for the Last Post, honouring first their Queen, as Sir Winston would have wished them to do, and then the great man himself. There was nothing shame-faced about this gesture which, no doubt, was nation-wide. It was, as I have said above, spontaneous. It did me personally great good; all the more so in view of the fact that it came at a time when the National Anthem is ceasing to be played, as it used to be, at the close of public occasions, when cinema-goers and others so lack the courtesy due to the Crown that they move off now, even when "God Save the Queen" is being played. Most do this because a few do it, following sheepishly and without guts the bad example set them by a conceited and bad-mannered few. This discourtesy to the Queen has proceeded logically from the spread of bad manners in the post-war years. Men no longer stand for ladies in buses and tubes. It is logical that a point should be reached when more and more should cease to stand for the Queen. Expressions of loyalty, of the type described, are only an excrescence for those who regard manners as a superfluity or see rudeness in cockeyed fashion as a manifestation of equality. These have been making the running of late, little men with a worm's-eye view. I fail to see why, in future, we should continue to

attach significance to anything they say or do. They do what they do and say what they say, not because they believe in it, but because they long to be noticed. Their one passion is for an audience. Publicity cannot be secured on their own merits, for they have none. Conscious of this and envious of those whose fame rests on genuine achievement, they resort to the sneer in order to draw attention to themselves. I fail to see why we should continue to indulge their conceit.

Winston Churchill was a great gentleman. As such, his courtesy was extended to everyone, not least to his Sovereign whom he honoured in a manner befitting her rank. But all were subjects of his good manners. Churchill gave to his countrymen the recognition that was their due. At the same time, he saw hierarchy as essential to the health of any society: he had no time for a false equalitarianism. It was his appreciation of the individual worth of each of his countrymen that cut through barriers which, otherwise, would have turned class into caste, and laid on the country he loved social rigidities from which there could be no escape except through revolution. England, for him was a prize shared by its citizens, with opportunities of advance before all who remained linked, at the same time, by love of country and mutual recognition of each other's worth. Appreciation of his countrymen was, I think, the key to the best in Churchill's character. It was made manifest, once again, at his funeral in the reverence of the watching crowds. "They were so quiet and so respectful", an overseas student said to me, "so full of respect for each other: no one was pushing".

A Nation of Takers

The attitude of onlookers at the funeral was sufficiently rare to warrant comment. The student unhappily was right. Consideration for others can be based only on an appreciation of individual worth. In England to-day, I am afraid, this is fading fast. The process is bound to occur in a secular society which places increasing emphasis on material advance as a sign of progress and, at the same

time, an equalising instrument. Grabbing becomes fashionable when social status is measured by the amount a man successfully grabs. When the greatest prizes in life are measured in material terms, other considerations give way to their pursuit. Grabbing becomes a way of life and consideration for others goes by the board. When Harold Macmillan told his countrymen in 1959 that they had never had it so good, he was not referring to manners or characters or courtesy. He was telling a nation of takers that, thanks to his Government, there was plenty to take—unlike Churchill, who offered his people nothing but blood and sweat and tears and found them responding magnificently. The difference is between greatness and mediocrity. Material wealth is not primary in any assessment of a nation's position. Its moral temper comes first. To-day in this country first place is given to the pursuit of wealth: no one should be surprised, therefore, at the mediocre tone of its public life. In a rat race only the rats get to the top. The unsuccessful spend their time trying to get there, lose their manners on the way and end up in frustration. Life, at all levels, becomes a free-for-all in pursuit of wealth at all costs. It is no coincidence that this is a time when the old are pushed aside.

Personal Gain and Public Good

If there is to be a rethink, as there must be, as a prelude to remaking ourselves, a start must be made with the realisation that material goods are not all. They have a part of immense importance to play in a nation's life and in that of each of its citizens. No one denies this, but they are not an end in themselves. This means, in practice, that they are not to be sought at the price of a nation's character. They are meant to be its support, never to subvert it. Where wealth is sought for its own sake, irrespective of other considerations, the easiest way to it is chosen by all. Under such circumstances, not only does the character of a nation suffer, but its economy very often collapses as well. The process of wealth-getting for its own sake can be self-defeating. There is nothing para-

doxical here. One has only to look, for example, to the present condition of Britain's economy, saved recently from collapse by an immense effort of international lending. The rescue operation was made necessary because of the chronic weakness of the industrial life upon which the economy of this country depends. This is due basically to the concern of management and labour with personal gain, not as a support for the process of individual living, but as an end in itself. Money has been pursued by management and labour for its own sake, as the supreme good, without appreciation of the true values in life or consideration for the rights of others. The philosophy of each side in industry, therefore, has been that of the easy way out, their endeavour to gain a living at the expense of each other and, consequently, of the community at large. Instead of expanding efficiently, management has wrapped itself in monopolistic practice and sought, thereby, to increase its share of the national income at the expense of the community as distinct from its service. At the same time, disinclination to recognise the claims of dignity has left it with little ability in the field of industrial relationships. Production, in consequence, has suffered. Again, management has set a bad example to its labour force through its use over recent years of the expense account as a means of personal enrichment and its adoption, since the turn of the century, of the long and extending week-end. Labour has retaliated, through its unions with restrictive practices as an instrument of extortion, a steadily degenerating quality of output and insistence on a level of wages, which bears little relationship to its actual production. Both sides of industry in this country seek to enrich themselves at the expense of each other and so, in the last analysis, of the community itself. What sets them on this path is a wrong set of priorities, which rates personal enrichment by any—and, therefore, the easiest—means as the prime objective of industrial effort. The materialistic outlook responsible for this wrong evaluation makes capital and labour careless, at the same time, of the means used to secure it. The easiest way to wealth-getting is at the expense of each other.

Industry, therefore, becomes a battlefield. Meanwhile, the economy suffers and, with it, the community as a whole. The world looks on whilst the English live on tick, looting each other as a means to personal enrichment, living in a world of make-believe, whilst their economy, like their character, crumbles away.

England in 1965

The spectacle is not a pretty one, the mentality from which it stems not confined to industry alone. On my way to Sir Winston's funeral I got on a bus bound for Victoria Station. The bus stopped at the end of its run a hundred yards short of its normal halting place. The reason for this I do not know: it may well have been a good one. The conductor never bothered to tell us why we were inconvenienced. No word of apology came from him. We were simply told to get out. As we got out, the teddy-boy driver climbed down from his seat and sauntered over to the conductor without a word of sympathy for the passengers. They might have been cattle. As I passed him, a copper came hurtling to his feet. "A penny for your trouble", shouted a red-faced angry man. "You rotten lot", screeched a woman, "You're not the only ones with work to do". No one gained a thing from this altercation. All it brings is further frustration. The root cause is selfishness, the driving force in the lives of those who spend them without giving a damn for others. This is England in 1965—slovenly, spiteful and selfish; less and less of a place to live in. It makes one desperately sad.

A Job for Each One

A pause is called for at this juncture. I began by noting the quiet pride you could feel seeping through the crowd on the kerbside that came to Churchill's funeral. This pride is the stuff of patriotism, best described as a habit of good action that makes a man strive to be worthy of the best there is in his country's heritage. Churchill, in this sense, was the greatest of patriots. He appreciated, as few have done, his island's worth. He understood and

loved its people. He saw his country's future as evolving with dignity and courage out of its past. The evolution had to be in freedom and the foundation of that was respect for one's countrymen and the institutions, forged in this island, that have made and kept them free. It has been my point hitherto in these notes that our present contentment with the mediocre and the second-rate is directly traceable to a preoccupation with the purely material, which has brought with it also an increasing lack of respect for each other. The two go together. Historical necessity may have pressed on us the status of a second-class power. Our problem is not here. It lies in this, that we are turning ourselves now into a second-rate people. It is no coincidence that we should be turning also into an ill-mannered one. The extraordinary thing about Churchill's funeral was that, for a few brief hours, manners and pride came back again. The conclusion, I think, is inescapable. Those who have the country's future at heart must do all in their power to combat the present ill-mannered materialism wherever they find it.

A whole number of ways present themselves which are open to all who love this country. Their number surely includes readers in Britain of this Review. One of the great mistakes of people to-day is to leave to others a task that needs to be done. If all do that nothing will be accomplished. What counts is the action of those who set themselves a task and do it, irrespective of whether their example is followed or not. As a matter of fact, it will be. We British are slow to move in these matters. Self-consciousness makes us sheepish, but we do respond to a lead. It is for the few to make a start. They would be surprised at what they can achieve. The story will be the familiar one of ripples spreading out from a pebble plunged into the middle of a pond. Examples come quickly to mind.

Courtesy and Self-Respect

I do not see, for instance, why we should go on allowing old ladies to be barged out of bus queues or tired

women to stand in the tube. Neither should we allow the public to be inconvenienced forever by loutish, scrumming teenagers on bus tops and in the streets. A word will check them and, speaking of words, there is no reason why "thank you" should not be given greater currency to-day and "please" brought once more into common usage. The faces one sees to-day in London crowds are the faces of people starved of courtesy. The rat race to which materialism commits them leaves no time for the ordinary decencies of life. It leaves people with no time to think, but responsive, nevertheless, to the power of example. What a difference a pleasant and well-mannered bus conductor can make to the top of a bus, a waiter to a restaurant, a girl to an office or a young apprentice to a factory floor. The thoughtful few who make time for the decencies of life can change the tone of their workaday world in no time. There is no reason why some doctors on the National Health should treat their patients to-day like irresponsible zombies. There is no reason why so many patients should behave as if they were. What is lacking in each case is that fundamental respect, for oneself and others, which flows from an appreciation of human worth and expresses itself in good manners.

Self-respect, of course, is intimately linked with respect for others. This may be why, in an age when undergraduates dress like tramps, the female of the species is frequently found behaving like one. Courtesy protects against tawdry intimacies which turn a nice girl into a cheap piece of goods and set sex at the level of the barnyard. If manners are an expression of respect, their absence invites mishandling, which can lead very soon to the wrecking of what should be innocent lives. There is a great work here that Catholic undergraduates can do in the universities of this country, an example they can set that should have profound results. The same sort of action is called for in other fields. I am thinking particularly of industry. Where pride in oneself goes, so, too, does pride in the job, as a result, industrial relations become bad. The worst workmen as a rule are those who shout loudest for

supposed rights. As restrictive practices have grown, the quality of work done has steadily decreased. Many, these days, have been driven to do their own home-decorating and repairs. This is usually attributed to the Englishman's love of pottering about. There is much in this. But it is due also to desperation. Ever since I can remember, the tiles at Claver House where I live have been falling steadily from bathroom walls. The cause is sloppy workmanship and nothing else. A slovenly man with no pride in himself and his work obviously did the original job. I should imagine he was a difficult man to deal with. He will have been his own worst enemy. There are thousands like him to-day on both sides of industry—old as well as young, with no pride in themselves and their work and without respect for others. Declarations of intent will not remove the evil situation they have created. No more will a technological revolution. What they need is a change of heart. Economics are not all. No more are machines. What counts is the quality of the men who run them. The task of the patriotic few in their field of work is to set standards that will restore self-respect and, with it, manners and pride in the job done.

Task for the Home

Without doubt the major task in the restoration of respect has to be done in the home. I have been responsible for the statement that the present generation of parents—those now with teenage children—is just about the worst this country has seen. I am inclined to stand by what I have said. I would add, of course, that the Welfare State, by discouraging parental responsibility, has diminished parental status and, with it, the quality of the children. The late Lord Beveridge and his helpers have a lot to answer for in terms of present, teenage irresponsibility, which is turning the young of to-day into a class selfish and apart from society with their own *mores* and their own secret store of unhappiness and frustration. It is harder now, despite far higher living standards, for parents to do their duty by their children, if only for the fact that

inducements in the way of their not doing so are placed all round them by wrong-headed and silly secular humanitarians. Under these circumstances, it is all the more necessary for parents who have right views on the matter of their responsibilities to give a lead that will take them clean against the prevailing secularism and extend to others the courage to follow their example.

A few to Begin

I have called ill-mannered materialism the enemy of this country's future. If we are to avoid becoming a second-rate people—a fate for England which no one really desires—we must react against its incidence wherever it is to be found. This is a task which each can undertake in the field of his workaday life. To the extent that we do this we give permanent expression to the values which appeared for those few remarkable and moving hours during which one of England's greatest sons made his last journey through our midst. The values that asserted themselves on that occasion cannot be imposed from without. National recovery is not a matter of directives from above. There is a profoundly true sense in which it has nothing to do with government, but everything, under God, to do with ourselves. The responsibility is pressing and it is ours. If the few begin the rest will follow. There can be no other way.

• *Thanks*

Thanks are due to all those who have renewed their subscriptions. Seven hundred new ones have been obtained. We must all keep up the good work.

MONTHLY REPORT

In 1954, the Communist Party gained complete control of North Vietnam. They proceeded to build a modern economy with the same perseverance, inefficiency, and disregard for individuals that communist governments have always shown, whether in Russia, China or Cuba. In this article P. J. Honey, a specialist on North Vietnam, who works for *China News Analysis* describes the wages and standard of living in North Vietnam after ten years of communist rule. The DRV is the abbreviation of the Vietnamese for "Democratic Republic of Vietnam".

North Vietnam after Ten Years*

P. J. HONEY

STUDENTS of North Vietnamese affairs have long since grown accustomed to government statistics expressed in millions of dong. These are useful, but they reveal little of the living standards of the ordinary Vietnamese worker, since the dong does not have any parity with other currencies and is valueless outside the country. To provide a full survey of wages for different jobs and the costs of the various goods on sale would require a lengthy book, especially since regional variation is appreciable. The following is a sample survey which will afford readers some idea of the standard at which the worker lives.

A Weaving Factory

The March 8 Weaving Factory in Hanoi, a newly constructed enterprise which is still incomplete, is a good

*Published with permission of *Social Survey* and issued by Institute of Social Order, Australia.

place to begin. It employs some 4,000 workers, the majority of them being women, and insists that new recruits undergo a minimum training period of 9 months before graduating to the status of official government workers. A trainee combing machine operator is required to tend 8 machines and work an 8-hour day with a 30-minute meal break. Three shifts are worked so that the factory is in operation 24 hours a day, and the employees receive one day's holiday each week when the three shifts change about. For this, the trainee worker is paid a wage of 21 dong per month. On completion of the 9-month training period the worker is subjected to a proficiency test and, if successful, is promoted to official government worker and receives a wage of 35 dong per month. The fully qualified combing machine operators are, however, required to tend 16 machines.

University Students

A full-time student of Hanoi University used to receive a government scholarship of 22 dong per month before the recent sharp economic decline. The sum was cut in half because of the economic crisis. To keep oneself alive on 11 dong per month is an undertaking which could be achieved only by an economic genius, as will become apparent when the prices of goods are given, and the result has been that numbers of students have had to abandon their studies to seek work. No mention of this has been made in the DRV press.

The medical school in Hanoi is remarkable for its very low standards. These are brought about by two factors, the desperate shortage of qualified teachers and the poor academic standards of the student at the time of admission. Nevertheless, the DRV does train its own doctors and a student must undergo a minimum period of 6 years' study before he may graduate. To become a graduate doctor does, therefore, demand a prolonged period of economic privation and hard work, so the wage of the graduate doctor is higher than that of the factory worker. In Hanoi he receives 60 dong per month.

Earnings of Tradesmen

Although wages paid in the larger government enterprises in different regions are identical, there is a wide variation in the earnings of tradesmen, which is dictated by the supply of workers and the need for their particular skills.

Thus, a trainee dyer and printer employed in the former French cotton factory at Nam-dinh receives 21 dong per month and serves a training period of 9 months. After graduation to the status of official government worker, the wage is increased to 35 dong. In the highland region of Cao-bang, however, a tailor earns a monthly wage of 35 dong but a carpenter earns 58 dong. The reason for the discrepancy is that carpenters are badly needed for construction work being carried out there. Similarly, in Hung-yen, a blacksmith earns a monthly wage of only 28 dong while a building worker engaged on house construction is paid 60 dong, the same sum as a graduate doctor. A garage worker in Ninh-binh, who flakes rust from motor vehicles and washes them, receives a wage of 44 dong per month. Another member of a tailors' co-operative in Hao-binh province earns roughly 60 dong per month, and a mechanic working in the Hao-binh Machine Factory, situated on the road between Hanoi and Ha-dong, earns 41 dong per month. Some idea of the range of wages paid may be obtained from this fairly random sample.

Leisure is Work

Lest it be imagined that workers earning insufficient money might supplement their incomes by performing extra work in their spare time, the following account of a typical Hanoi worker will show how difficult that would be.

He regularly works a basic 48-hour 6-day week, but is required to perform an extra 8 or 16 hours per week, whenever requested by the Party. This is called voluntary work and is usually said to be for some specific purpose, depending upon whatever emulation campaign happens to be in force at the time. To refuse voluntary work would be dangerous and would, at the very least, result in the worker's being sent away for a re-education course. Even

if he completed it successfully, there is no certainty that he would be allowed to resume his former employment. This particular individual teaches on two evenings of the week, again "voluntarily", usually on Mondays and Thursdays. On Tuesday evenings he must attend a compulsory political education course, and on Wednesdays he must be present at meetings of his mass organisation.

On top of all this, he is required to perform guard duty at his place of work every fourth night. Each month he must complete 16 hours of military training and has to contribute one "voluntary" day of labour for socialist construction. It will be readily apparent that he is fortunate if he can find sufficient time to sleep and eat.

Poor Families

Less easy to generalize about is the money which individual families have to spend in the course of a month because this will depend, in each case, on the number of family members working and the number of non-earning dependants. One couple, for example, where the husband repairs looms and the wife repairs gunny bags, have an average joint monthly income of 100 dong, so that they are well off. Another man, who earns his living by pulling a cart—the use of human labour for draught purposes is widespread—tried unsuccessfully to support his younger brother until the latter graduated from school. When the boy was still one year away from graduation the unequal struggle became too much. The younger brother was obliged to abandon his studies and he, too, now pulls a cart. No mercy is shown to those who cannot support themselves and anyone without sufficient money to buy food simply starves.

Bicycles, Necessary Luxuries

The costs of petrol and road taxes are so astronomically high that no North Vietnamese could afford to run his own private car even if petrol were sold for private consumption, which it is not. That is a luxury reserved for foreign technicians and diplomats. Yet public transport is so poor

and so expensive that the ambition of all North Vietnamese is to own a bicycle. Those fortunate enough to have relations living abroad beg these to send them bicycles, but the rest must purchase their own or do without. The would-be customer must first obtain a licence which shows that he has fulfilled a number of conditions laid down by the authorities. Licences are provided freely for government cadres, but ordinary unprivileged Vietnamese often find them very difficult to obtain. Those who are unsuccessful are obliged to pay extra, to buy a more expensive imported machine, or to buy a second-hand bicycle at an inflated price.

The DRV manufactures its own brands of bicycle, the *Thong Nhat* (Unity) and the *Huu Nghi* (Friendship); but many of the parts are imported from abroad and simply assembled by the Vietnamese. Their reputation is not high, and complaints about the wheels (which were not round), the handle-bars (which fell off), the bolts (which dropped out), etc., have frequently been published in the North Vietnamese press. Holders of licences might buy either bicycle for 300 dong, which appears to be a fixed price settled by the government, but the following prices were being asked for these bicycles from customers without licences:

Cam-pha	390 dong
Hoa-binh	427 dong
Vinh	450 dong
Duong-lang	400 dong

Some imported bicycles were also on sale, and the average prices of these were:

French Peugeot bicycle	700 dong
Czech Paforit bicycle	700 dong
Chinese bicycle	612 dong

Bicycle tyres cost approximately 30 dong per pair.

Thus it will be seen that, even if one is well enough connected to obtain a licence, one must still pay the equivalent of 5 months' pay for a doctor or 15 months' pay for a trainee worker in a government factory to buy a very inferior bicycle.

Food Prices

Even more important than transport is food, of which supplies are very scarce and depend to a great extent upon local conditions. In Gia-luong district of Bac-ninh province, for example, the last tenth-month rice crop failed completely and numbers of people starved to death. In some villages there small quantities of sweet potatoes and vegetables were on sale, but not a single grain of rice was to be found in the whole district. In Hanoi, on the other hand, rations were generally honoured, a flourishing black market was in operation, and meals were available in restaurants for all those who could afford to pay the high prices asked.

Ration Books

The system works in the following way. The North Vietnamese government has fixed the prices of nearly all foods and issues ration coupons for their purchase. The rations are admitted to be insufficient but, while supplies are available, stocks are sold in government shops and markets at the official prices. Sometimes, when supplies are obviously inadequate, rations are reduced or cancelled altogether, and sometimes the shops sell food while stocks last to those who come first. The remainder are told that stocks have been exhausted and no food remains.

The Black Market

The mere fact of possessing a ration coupon is no guarantee of being able to buy the amount of food to which it entitles one. Consequently, everybody seeks to be first at the shops which results in lengthy queues and many hours of wasted time. Even if one successfully purchases one's full food ration, this will be insufficient to keep one alive and healthy for the month, so one is obliged to buy supplementary supplies of food in the local black market, where prices are not fixed and are generally very high.

Although the communist authorities disapprove of black market dealings and are eager to bring them to an end, they have learned from harsh experience that the state cannot function without them. Food producers are most

reluctant to sell their produce to the authorities for the low prices paid, and they conceal as much as they think they can safely get away with. The only effective method of inducing them to place this hidden food on sale has proved to be the black market, so it is permitted to operate. Those whose earnings are insufficient to pay the high prices demanded by the black marketeers must go without or acquire money from some other source, and this had led to widespread thefts of materials from factories or construction sites and to embezzlement among management.

Rice Substitutes

Rice has, from time immemorial, been the staple food of the Vietnamese. The basic cereal ration is at present 13 kilograms per month, but only about two-thirds of this is rice, the remaining third being maize or dried tapioca chips. In Dong-hoi, for example, the ration consists of 9 kilos of rice and 4 of tapioca chips. When tapioca chips were first introduced, few people could bring themselves to eat them, but they now consume them regularly if unenthusiastically. The fixed government prices for rice are appropriately .40 dong per kilo for two inferior qualities and .50 dong for the better quality grain, but the average black market price is 1.50 per kilo, or more than three times as dear.

Thus it will be apparent that the purchase of one ration and a few extra kilos of black market rice makes a large hole in a monthly salary of 35 dong even when the worker has nobody but himself to keep. Where there are dependants as well, it becomes the major item of expenditure.

Meat and Fat

The ration of meat and fat stands at 100 grammes per month, though it is not always honoured, so that anyone who can afford it is more or less driven to buying meat in the black market.

Pork is the favourite and most widely eaten meat, and prices are subject to large variation from one area to another. In Vinh, for example, the fixed government price of a kilo of pork is 1.25 dong and the black market price is

2,25 dong, while in Ninh-binh the fixed price is 2.50 dong and the black market price almost double that. Fixed prices for a kilo of fish and a kilo of chicken in Ninh-binh are 2.50 and 3 dong respectively and the black market prices are proportionately higher.

Complaints from Yen-bay state that both food and goods are very scarce there and that rice is available for only about half the meals. For the other half people have to make do with tapioca. Residents of Quang-binh say that their meals consist in the main of one of three dishes, maize, sweet potato, or tapioca.

Condiments and Sauces

Other specimen prices of foodstuffs are 2.30 dong for a kilo of white sugar, 60 dong for a kilo of unground white pepper, 100 dong for a kilo of black pepper, and 100 dong for a kilo of seasoning powder.

All Vietnamese are accustomed to flavour their food with a type of fermented fish sauce peculiar to Vietnam, but the better quality sauce is now exported to China for resale to overseas Vietnamese communities. A litre bottle of very inferior grade sauce, which usually has sandy dregs in the bottom, costs 1.50 dong and is beyond the reach of many.

Making Ends Meet

One Hanoi worker said recently that the National Trade Office did not provide nearly enough food on ration at fixed prices and the cost of black market food was rising rapidly so that, even though he worked long hours every week, he was no longer able to make ends meet. The price of a small breakfast for his young son had risen from .10 to .20 dong. The worker himself could not afford to eat breakfast and, in consequence, his arms and legs felt quite numb by 9 a.m. when he was working.

Most organisations have collective canteens where members may take their meals, but the average cost of barely adequate food in such a place ranges between 21 and 25 dong per month, so that little remains from an ordinary salary for other necessities.

Full Shops

The two-storied Bach-Hoa Tong-Hop store in Hanoi offers for sale a wide selection of goods: cloth, shoes, hats, toilet powder and perfumes, lamps, furniture, radios, watches, crockery, enamelware, and so on, but the display serves only to tantalise the hard-pressed citizens. Most goods cannot be purchased without coupons, which are usually very difficult to obtain unless one has good connections. The government's reasoning is that, if goods were sold freely, the shortages would force up prices and cause a runaway inflation, so it fixes prices and controls consumption by means of coupons. This tactic has the added propaganda advantage of allowing visiting foreigners to see stocks of moderately priced goods in shops and to imagine that no shortages exist. Being unable to understand the Vietnamese language or to communicate with any Vietnamese other than government officials, they are unaware of the coupon system and return home with the impression that there is a plentiful supply of consumer goods in North Vietnam. A notable case of a gulled visitor is that of a university professor from the United States who spent a few days in North Vietnam and, since his return, has not ceased to argue that reports of shortages there are sheer fabrications.

Returning Exiles

A steady trickle of Vietnamese who have lived abroad for many years return to North Vietnam from France or New Caledonia. Misled by the propaganda and tempted by home-sickness, they return to spend the remaining years of their lives in their own country. They bring with them their life savings, which are sometimes considerable, and thus arrive to find themselves wealthy in a nation of very poor people.

The government tries to separate them from their accumulated capital as quickly as possible, but does not confiscate the money lest this discourage others from returning. Luxury goods are placed in the shops for sale without coupons but at high prices. Imported cameras, radios, watches, and other non-essential goods tempt the

returnees. A Japanese Nivico radio, for example, costs 1,000 dong, an Omega watch sells from 400 dong upwards depending on the style, and imported sewing machines are available from 700 dong. Nor are the less costly articles such as might be bought for children's presents neglected, and they can find such items as violins at 150 dong each, airguns at 60 dong, table-tennis bats at 52 dong, and so on. The newly returned exiles are naturally anxious to impress their friends and relatives, but haven't yet had time to accustom themselves to the real worth of money in North Vietnam so they tend to purchase these goods freely. The repatriates will, of course, require jobs and houses, which enables the authorities to acquire more of their money. A three-roomed house was recently sold in Nam-dinh to a returned exile for as much as 8,000 dong, though admittedly it had a well, a water storage tank, and a paved yard for drying paddy. Less well appointed was a two-roomed house in Thanh-hoa sold to a poorer returnee for 2,200 dong.

These people are rarely permitted to remain in Hanoi or Haiphong but are sent off to settle in the provinces, usually a long way from their birth-places. The majority of them find it necessary to become members of a co-operative, but they cannot be admitted unless they contribute something as the price of entry. For example, one or two buffaloes may be demanded from a person wishing to join an agricultural co-operative, and the price of buffalo is roughly 1,100 dong. Someone wishing to join a tailoring co-operative will be expected to contribute one or two sewing machines, and so on. The experience of virtually all exiles who have returned to North Vietnam is that, after a few months, they have dissipated all their savings, have resold at a heavy loss their transistor radios, cameras, etc., and are in exactly the same circumstances as those who have never been outside the country.

Clothes and Medicine

To return to wages and prices. Wool is on sale for the making of warm garments to wear during the cold winter. The price is 20 dong a ball, and it requires 5 balls to make

a long-sleeved cardigan. To hire someone to knit it costs a further 10 dong, so the total cost of a cardigan is 100 or 110 dong, well beyond the means of the ordinary worker. Tiger balm ointment, long a very popular healer with all Vietnamese, is sold at 8 dong a tin. Cloth is rationed at 4 metres per annum, but can only be bought by those who can certify that their need is genuine. Chinese manufactured poplin costs 1.70 dong per metre, khaki drill 4 dong per metre, and waterproof cloth 5 dong per metre. A torch costs 13 dong and a torch battery 1.25 dong. A kilo of dry betelnut—the Vietnamese are great betelnut chewers—costs 18 dong.

A Dreary Life

From all this it will be apparent that simply to keep oneself alive in North Vietnam is a never-ending struggle. Life itself is dreary, consisting of long working hours, extra "voluntary" labour, attendance at political or mass organisation meetings, participation in endless series of "spontaneous" demonstrations or emulation campaigns, frustrating queueing to buy food or other necessities, and military training. Privacy has long since disappeared, and people have no time for anything but eating and sleeping in the few hours they are permitted to spend in their own homes. Family life, as it used to exist, has vanished because few families can contrive to find any time to devote to social activities together, and many families have been split, their members being scattered throughout the country. There are many signs of weariness and discontent, and the fact that guards must be mounted on buildings and factories at night is sufficient indication of the extent to which sabotage is carried out.

The paradise on earth promised by Ho Chi Minh once the French had been defeated has still failed to materialise.

Despite Beveridge the governments since 1942 have paid social security benefits at rates below subsistence level. Serious thought must now be given to the provision of adequate incomes as a right. And this income, Dr. Jackson argues, should bear a reasonable relationship to a man's normal earnings.

Poverty To-day

J. M. JACKSON

IN 1948, when the National Insurance and National Assistance schemes came into operation, many people thought that poverty would soon be a thing of the past. The National Insurance scheme was designed to provide the great majority of citizens with a source of income in most of the foreseeable vicissitudes of life. The provision of unemployment and sickness benefit, and a pension on retirement were the most important benefits. National Assistance was intended to provide for the more unusual, less foreseeable eventualities, which could not be appropriately dealt with by means of an insurance scheme. Under this heading might come the unemployed school-leaver who had not contributed to the insurance scheme and so qualified for benefit, the deserted wife, and so on.

Subsistence Level

In fact, things did not work out like this at all. When Beveridge drew up his report on social security in 1942, he had intended that National Insurance benefits (other than retirement pensions) should have been at a subsistence level. Retirement pensions would have been gradually raised to subsistence level over a period of perhaps ten years. The scheme was based on the principle that people earned the right to benefit by virtue of the contributions they had paid. This meant that pensioners ought not to

expect the full rate of benefit unless they paid contributions for a substantial period at the new rates and so helped to accumulate a fund from which the pensions would be paid. The alternatives to Beveridge's proposal were to set all benefits below the subsistence level, or set contribution rates very high to meet the cost of raising pensions immediately. The government chose to put all benefits at the same level, and below subsistence. Although the rates of benefit have been increased from time to time, they have remained below the subsistence level. As a result, National Assistance has been a safeguard for those who fall outside the insurance net. It does cater for these, but primarily, it supplements the benefits of those who cannot manage on National Insurance. Payment of National Assistance benefit is, of course, subject to a means test, and many people are still reluctant to claim benefit when they are in need and entitled to it. Although it was hoped that there would be no stigma attached to applying for National Assistance, memories are long and those with experience of the means test in the inter-war years are still reluctant to apply for National Assistance if they can possibly help it.

Adequate Income

There is, then, obviously need for serious thought to be given to our social security arrangements. A great many questions suggest themselves. There is clearly need for a higher level of benefit, if possible providing most people with an adequate income *as of right*. We should, moreover, be thinking in terms of an income bearing a reasonable relationship to a man's normal earnings, not a bare subsistence. Can we get around the need for the means test in the majority of the cases that fall outside any insurance scheme? What should be the role of the state in this field? Even if we agree that there is a case for the state's being closely associated with the organisation of a scheme that would ensure a basic minimum to everybody, there still remains the question of whether or not it should play any part in the provision of benefits over and above this

minimum. Finally, there is the difficult question of whether poverty and need are confined to those who are sick or out of work or have retired, or whether there is still poverty to be found among the poorly paid workers in industry to-day.

Most people will probably agree that it is no longer enough to think of providing everybody with a certain minimum standard of subsistence. There is bound to be some standard below which we think nobody should fall. For the moment, it does not matter what that standard is. For the sake of argument, let us suppose that a man and wife could manage reasonably on £7 a week. A man who has been earning £10 a week will be feeling a bit of a pinch when he comes down to £7: the man who has been earning £15 or £20 a week will feel the pinch even more, and may experience really serious difficulty in managing. A man who has been earning this kind of wage may have certain fixed commitments which he cannot readily alter when his circumstances change. There is, therefore, a strong case for linking social security benefits, whatever form they take, to normal earnings.

Retirement Pensions

To date, the National Insurance scheme has not attempted to relate benefits to earnings except to a very limited extent in the case of retirement pensions. Employer and worker each pay 4½ per cent on the workers' earnings over £9 and under £18 a week. The pensioner receives an additional 6d. a week pension for each £15 of graduated contributions paid. Thus a man who paid graduated contributions on a wage of £15 a week for ten years would get an extra pension of about 8s. 6d. Men who contribute on this scale for a working life of 40 years will get an additional pension of 34s. a week, still a relatively small increase by comparison with the basic pension of £4 a week for a single man. There can really be little doubt that the real purpose of the graduated scheme is to bring in additional contributions *here and now* to help towards the cost of the present flat-rate scheme. This is shown by the fact that where a man is contracted out of the graduated scheme, he will be paying

nearly 6s. a week more (together with his employer) in flat rate contributions—this is equivalent to the joint graduated contribution on a wage of about £12 10s. a week. No attempt, so far, has been made to introduce a graduated element into sickness or unemployment benefit.

The case for relating these benefits to normal earnings is at least as strong as that for relating pensions to earnings. Often (but by no means always) sickness and unemployment are very temporary. Nevertheless, they may hit families with young children, families where the home is still being built up, and where mortgage and hire purchase commitments continue in spite of the reduction in income. Some advance has been made in this direction, but not through the government's National Insurance scheme.

Sick-pay Schemes

The improvements that have occurred in this field have been made independently of government action. Many workers have, for a long time, enjoyed the benefits of sick-pay schemes operated by their employers, and a very substantial element of security in their employment. Gradually, employers' sick-pay schemes are being extended beyond the white collar workers and supervisors to manual workers, though the movement still needs to go very much further. That interest is being taken in this, by the Ministry of Labour and by both sides of industry is seen from the publication of a working party report on the subject in recent months. The government is also giving thought to the question of redundancy compensation, and in particular instances arrangements for compensation have been agreed between firms and unions. Redundancy compensation not only softens the blow of losing a job, but is also likely to make workers more willing generally to accept technological changes that may involve redundancy.

Governmental Responsibilities

The question is raised here of how far the government itself should concern itself with the provision of social security services and how far it should leave the actual

provision to other agencies. It has generally been accepted as a principle of Catholic social teaching that the state should not take over functions that could effectively be undertaken by lesser organisations, though equally lesser organisations should not undertake what can only properly be undertaken by the state. Clearly, National Assistance or some similar scheme is properly the function of the government, which must, in the last resort, accept responsibility for ensuring that everybody has at least the barest necessities of life. This is not to say there is no place for private charity, but only that the ultimate responsibility lies with the government. It is also clear that it would be unsatisfactory to allow large numbers to become completely dependent upon such a scheme. It is far more satisfactory for people to be made to contribute to some kind of insurance scheme that will provide them with a reasonable income in most eventualities. It may be argued that a government scheme can be more certain of achieving the universal coverage that is desirable than any other arrangement. There may, therefore, be a case for retaining something in the nature of the present National Insurance scheme, but perhaps trying over a period to bring the level of benefit more into line with our concepts of subsistence. And thus we should do away with the need to supplement insurance benefits by National Assistance when a person is without other means and is likely to be claiming benefit for a prolonged period.

Individual Arrangements

Over and above this level of provision, the case for allowing people to make their own arrangements either individually or collectively with their employers and fellow workers is very much sounder. Such arrangements will give rise to a very much stronger entitlement to the appropriate benefit than any government scheme. In a compulsory government scheme, there must always remain some danger that in a financial crisis, the terms will be changed. For example, a widow was originally entitled to a pension under National Insurance if she were over 40

when her husband died, but later the age was raised to 50. No private insurance company would be allowed to modify the terms of a policy in this way. Furthermore, if a man is free to make his own arrangements for social security, he may be able to obtain just the kind of provision he wants. If a government scheme attempts to do too much, it may make it difficult for him to make supplementary arrangements to cover its omissions.

Income Guarantee

No attempt has so far been made to raise National Insurance benefits to a subsistence level. New rates have just come into operation, but National Assistance benefits have also been raised by a similar amount. We have, therefore, revised our ideas of what constitutes the minimum standard of living that should be available to all in our affluent society, but we have done nothing towards ensuring that that minimum should be available without the necessity of a means test. The Labour Party is, however, considering more far-reaching reforms in the field of social security. One idea that has been widely canvassed is the *income guarantee*. The underlying idea of this is that a person should make a return of his income each year to the Inland Revenue authorities. Most people have to do this already, and if their incomes are high enough they are required to pay income tax. What is now being suggested is that this same return could be used, in the case of those with very low incomes, to assess the extent to which the state should supplement their incomes.

Problems of Rent

The underlying idea is simple, but in practice the income guarantee would involve difficulties. It would clearly be applicable only to those whose circumstances were unlikely to change. It would be appropriate for pensioners, but not for younger people who were in acute but temporary difficulties as a result of sickness or unemployment. Even for old people, the system would involve a more serious difficulty, the determination of the appropriate rate of

benefit. Under the present National Assistance scheme, the practice of the National Assistance Board is to bring a married couple's income up to £6 5s. 6d. a week *after paying the rent*. In other words, the N.A.B. will, in addition to bringing a person's income to this level, pay his rent within reasonable limits. Even under the present scheme, this gives rise to difficulties. In some parts of the country, rents are very high, and the Board will not always regard the rent actually being paid as reasonable. While National Assistance should obviously make no attempt to pay the rents of people who choose to live in luxury flats, the implementation of its regulations involves the danger of hardship for some people who have no real alternative to paying very high rents.*¹ If the income guarantee is put into operation, some kind of average rent must be taken into account. If, for example, it were thought that on average a retired person needs to pay 17s. 6d. rent, the income guarantee might be fixed at £7 3s.*² The average rent paid varies, of course, from one part of the country to another. If any single figure were chosen, some people would still be in difficulties, whilst others would be given perhaps substantially more than the minimum they needed. Even within any one area, there will be pensioners paying relatively high rents and others living rent free.

Means Test

The income guarantee should, therefore, be approached with caution. Old people particularly dislike the means test, and are reluctant to apply for National Assistance, even though they are in real need. The scheme, therefore, has its attractions. If, however, it is fixed at a point where it would cover the needs of people with fairly high rents, it would give more than enough to many others, and would, therefore, be very costly. If, on the other hand, the allowance for rent is fairly modest, it will mean that there will be some who still need help, and to get it would have

*¹ The N.A.B. must also protect itself against the danger that the rents of long-term beneficiaries would be deliberately raised if it were thought the Board would always pay.

*² £6 5s. 6d. + 17s. 6d.

to apply for National Assistance and submit to a means test as at present. They would, however, be no worse off than now: if they had not been claiming National Assistance, they would be better off, even though they were still below the National Assistance scale. This, then, is one reform which at least merits serious consideration. It would, at least, have this important merit. It would raise the incomes of a great many pensioners to a reasonable level without the need for them to apply for National Assistance, and without the need to submit to a means test, whilst avoiding the tremendous cost of raising all pensions to a subsistence level.

Sickness and Unemployment Benefit

Sickness and Unemployment involve very much smaller numbers at any one time, and adequate provision for the needs of the sick and unemployed would not be unduly onerous. In the past, by tying all the principle rates of benefit together, the burden of raising retirement pensions has prevented reforms in other fields. Sickness and Unemployment Benefit should, as soon as possible, be raised to a minimum subsistence level, with anything over and above this provided through firms' or industries' sick pay and redundancy compensation schemes.

There are many aspects of poverty that have not been touched upon in this article. The position of widows has already been improved by the abolition of the earnings rule as it effects their benefits under National Insurance. It should be possible to bring them also under an income guarantee if this idea were implemented. The far more serious problem is that of low earnings. Even though average earnings in industry are now over £18 a week, many men earn substantially less than this, some under £10. This is less than enough to keep a family at the standard of living they would enjoy on National Assistance. This is a problem that must be considered in a subsequent article.

Should we think about canonizing Thomas Cranmer? What can we make of the cruelty in the Old Testament especially in regard to God's instructions? Why do we speak of God choosing when we know that he does not change? How can the Church expect families to support too many children?

Any Questions?

WILLIAM LAWSON, S.J.

Now that we are going back to a vernacular liturgy, how about canonizing Thomas Cranmer?

IF we have made a mistake, let us now make a handsome confession: but we needn't go crazy.

We can't go back to a vernacular liturgy: we never had one. And now that we have the beginnings of English in the liturgy we need not look shamefacedly at Cranmer, as though he were the prophet with the right ideas whom we have neglected for hundreds of years. On the contrary we can charge Cranmer with having postponed the introduction of the genuine liturgy in English by forcing us into the use of Latin and depriving us of an alternative. The insurgent Cornish Catholics in Cranmer's time demanded the restoration of the Latin Mass not because they understood Latin better than English but because they wanted the Mass and not the Communion Service of the Prayer Book, and because they knew that English had been introduced partly as a defiance of the Pope's authority. We are not now imitating the Protestants: they were thinking against the Church, and we are thinking with the Church — there could not be a greater difference.

The Protestants, by their defiant use of English, compelled the Catholics to stick to Latin. Worse than that, they cut off the English Catholics from their native culture and drove them into foreign parts and foreign ways. The first

generation of the persecuted English Catholics can match stylists such as Cranmer. The Douai version of the Bible will bear comparison with the Protestant versions. Southwell and Persons and dozens of others were masters of English. If religious exiles lose the feel of their native language, and talk with a foreign accent, whose fault is that?

As for canonization, if the Anglican church had such a judicial process, I doubt if Cranmer would be put up as an edifying candidate for it.

How do you explain God's specific instructions to the chosen people to behave with cruelty—e.g. Jephthe's vow in Judges 11?

THE example you have chosen is not to your purpose. Jephthe made the solemn but irresponsible vow to God that, if he defeated the Ammonites, "whosoever shall come first out of the doors of my house . . . the same will I offer a holocaust to the Lord". It was his only daughter who came out first to meet him, and he sacrificed her to God (it is not clear whether he put her to death or refused to let her marry).

Jephthe's vow, and his fulfilment of it, cannot be attributed to God. They were plainly a gross breach of the law forbidding human sacrifice. The vow should not have been made: the victory should not have been taken as a sign of God's approval of the vow: and the vow should not have been kept.

There are many practices attributed in the Bible to God's direct command, for example the massacre of the inhabitants of conquered cities such as Jericho. But many of the customs of the chosen people, though they appear in their law as commandments from God, were only permitted by God, as is shown in our Lord's explanation to the disciples of the practice of divorce sanctioned in the mosaic law. The Israelites had a special divine revelation, and they were bound to God in a unique alliance: but their understanding of God's will was often crude, as Jephthe showed. In our Lord's phrase, they suffered from "hardness of heart".

The ruthlessness of the Israelites towards their enemies

was an expression of their sense of God's power over his creation and their duty to make a world which recognized God's supreme authority. They had to learn, from the prophets rather than from the law, that God is also the Father of all mankind and has mercy on all.

Why do we talk nonsense about God? To say that he is merciful is to say that he chooses. But God cannot choose.

YOU are rash to condemn large parts of the Scriptures as nonsense. The difficulty you raise has been raised before — by St. Augustine, for example, in his Confessions, where he remarks, as you do, that God does not change, and that there is no choice in him between justice and mercy. But what are we to do? It is easy to condemn anthropomorphism — making God in our image and likeness, and talking of God in human terms. But the only language we have is human. Do you want us to cease thinking of God and expressing our thoughts? The Scripture says: "Glorify the Lord as much as ever you can, for he will yet far exceed, and his magnificence is wonderful". And St. Augustine concludes: "Woe to those who are silent about you, O God: for even those who speak are dumb".

Mercy is a goodness, and so is justice. As God is all good, and as he is one and undivided, his divinity is mercy, just as it is justice — and all the rest of what, in an attempt to understand, we call the attributes of God. St. James talks of mercy exalting itself above justice — and from a human point of view so it does.

Just as, if we are to speak of God at all, we must use human language, so we must speak according to the condition in which we live. Our life is in time: it includes "before" and "after". We must talk of that succession as known to God: but we understand that God is outside time, and that his knowledge of our succession does not give him "before" and "after". The very Scriptures which use so many anthropomorphic terms also include phrases such as "God in whom there is no change nor shadow of alteration".

Can you tell me just how the Church—with her teaching on birth limitation—really expects children, in excess of what the breadwinner can frugally support, to be supported?

THAT is the operative question in a long letter. The accompanying explanation, which is too long to quote, refers to the difficulties met by the parents of large families in the way of providing the necessities of life, and the unwillingness of many better-off Christians to give of their abundance for the relief of such families.

The letter seems to assume that the Church's teaching sets no limits to the number of children in a family. But is that true? The ordinary doctrine is that parents have a duty to provide for their children. It is not easy to decide in a particular case what number of children can be provided for by their parents. In a welfare state like Great Britain many obligations formerly resting on parents have been undertaken by the community. And how much, in calculations, should be expected from the Providence of God? I suppose there would be general agreement that it would be wrong to have children with no hope of providing for them: but such a generalization is little help except in the rare case of parents who are grossly irresponsible. The great majority of parents in this country can make the essential provision for their children: and the question then is: what more than a frugal life is a right in poor families, and who is responsible for ensuring the enjoyment of that right?

The reluctance of the better-off to meet the needs of the poor when requested to do so by private persons or organizations may be due to a feeling that poverty should not exist in a welfare state, that they are heavily taxed for the support of the poorer sections of the community, and they need not, and perhaps should not, pay yet more to save the irresponsible.

Fair enough: but there is still blameless poverty.

Learning from the Communists* — 2

LINKING THEORY AND PRACTICE

DOUGLAS HYDE

I SPOKE to you of the dedication of the Communist. I want to carry on from there to the actual techniques which the Communist Party uses in order to make the most of the people it has at its disposal. I would like to remind you that we are looking at communist methods, not with the idea of studying communist methods as such, but to see what we can learn from them, being selective in our approach to them, looking only at those which we may either imitate or apply to our work, or which may help us in some way.

The Communist Party everywhere is a minority—usually a small minority. We are very often preoccupied with the fact that we are a minority. As I told you, I joined the Communist Party when I was seventeen so I spent all my late adolescence and early manhood with the Communists, my formative years. I had always been conscious of the fact that the membership of the Communist Party was small but we had always taken it for granted that we had a world to win and we were going to win it.

Minority Complex

I was astounded when I joined the Catholic Church for very soon I began to hear people talking of what they describe as a minority complex, which British Catholics are

*This series of eight self-contained articles, which we publish under the general title of *Learning from the Communists* contains, exactly as they were spoken, six conferences given by Douglas Hyde in the United States to a specially convened gathering of missionaries in September, 1962. They have been published recently by the Mission Secretariat in Washington D.C. I am extremely grateful to the Executive Secretary, Father Frederick A. McGuire, C.M. and to Douglas Hyde for their kind permission to reproduce in *Christian Order*. It is hoped that a book based on these extremely important conferences will be published later on in Britain by Messrs. Sands. *Editor.*

supposed to suffer from. I do not know if you have a minority complex here. But here were British Catholics—nearly 5,000,000 of them out of a population of 50,000,000—in other words, ten per cent, talking about a minority complex, whereas in the days when we Communists had 15,000 people out of 50,000,000, we believed that we were going to make Britain Communist.

To me it was just astounding that people who had such numbers at their disposal—had the truth at their disposal—who had everything that the communists lack—should be going around conscious of the fact that they were a minority and that they were having a very hard fight against a big majority.

The Communists do not think in those terms at all. They set out, as I told you, to make every member of the Party a hard core member, into a leader. So we had 15,000 trained leaders operating in every walk of British life. We were effective and we knew we were effective in spreading our ideas. Supposing we had immensely more Christian leaders than we have, imagine the impact that we might make.

I want to show you the sheer mechanics, as it were, of leading people to a state of mind where they are anxious to become leaders and then tell you how they are made into leaders. As I describe the communist method, I want you to relate what I say to the lay apostolate and in your minds ask yourselves how far could this apply to our own work—how far might it be used.

I talked to you of the tremendous dedication of the majority of the Communists. Often people say to me, how can they be so dedicated? It does not just happen. There is a whole technique, if you like, a whole approach which is aimed at making them dedicated, which helps to explain why they are dedicated.

Party in Action

The average person who joins the Communist Party does so knowing very little about Communism. This goes as much for the intellectuals as it does for the workers who

join the Party. It is quite wrong to think the intellectual is always guided by his intellect—he can be guided by his emotions just as much as anyone else.

People who come in to the Communist Party have usually seen—and this is important to the whole thing—usually seen the Communist Party in action, in some way. Someone they know is associated with it or someone where they work is active, collecting signatures for peace petitions or working to try to improve the conditions at the place of work, or to get higher salaries. Or maybe they see the Party in action in the shape of a campaign run by Communists to prevent a widow from being evicted from her slum dwelling. They see the Party in action and they admire what the Party is doing. They are attracted by a particular campaign. They then become aware of other campaigns which the Party is running and they find that these correspond to what they feel is useful and desirable as well.

In other words, it is the Party in action and the Party as people which provide the normal first approach to Communism.

I only had one man in twenty years come to me by what I would call the purely intellectual route to Communism. He turned up at my office one day and he said: "I have read the whole of the works of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Plekhanov. I have discovered that I am a dialectical materialist and I ought to be organised. Please, may I join the Communist Party?" That is really the intellectual way of coming.

Most of them do not come like that at all. As I say, they see the Party in action. They are drawn into action by people and by campaigns which they feel meet a real need and so begin to associate with Communists. Now this business of association with Communists in action is important.

Appeal of the Dedicated Man

I believe that it is profoundly true to say that the more materialistic our society becomes, the more the dedicated man stands out by way of contrast, and the greater, therefore, is his appeal. The dedicated man has an appeal and

the Communist is a dedicated man. So your person who comes under the influence of Communism in the shape of communist activity begins to meet dedicated people. He has not met very many—may never have met any. He may have moved exclusively in Catholic circles and he still may not have met a dedicated person. You know that as well as I do.

Most certainly if he is living with an ordinary cross-section of your public or mine or overseas in the missions, he will not have been living with a group of dedicated people. Now he is suddenly plunged into an exhilarating experience of associating with people for whom life has a real meaning, who have a single aim, a singleness of purpose, the whole of the time and who are giving everything they have got. So his first impressions of Communists and Communism are these.

If you ask me how it was possible for me as a boy from a deeply religious family, with a deeply religious background, to go to atheistic Communism? I would say: "Oh yes, I read books on Communism—a great many of them before I joined the Party. But more important, I met Communists; I was impressed by them because of their dedication. I have been impressed by them as people. Therefore, I was conditioned to be sympathetic to what I read. I was responsive to what they stood for and I would say that that probably is the key to the explanation of how it is possible for someone to go from a deeply religious background to the Communist Party, knowing it is atheistic. This is typical of the experience of a person who begins to associate with Communism. It is an exhilarating experience. Having associated with the Communists for some time, they ask him if he will join the Party.

A Big Decision

What does joining the Party mean to him? Now, you can become a Catholic, make the first approach to the Church because you want to marry a girl, or alternatively you want to marry a boy, who is a Catholic. You can go

to your instruction and you receive the instruction all right, but you do not necessarily get the impression of your becoming a Catholic meaning that the whole of your life will be changed, from early morning till late at night, that you are now going to become part of a group of dedicated people.

But when someone is approached by a Communist, asked to join the Communist Party, having seen Communism in action, he will know that Communists are dedicated. Therefore, if he makes the decision to join the Party, he knows that is a big decision. It is not to be taken light-heartedly. It will involve his becoming dedicated, too. On our side, if we have a low general level on the part of the mass of our people, then we have people coming in as our converts, who also come at that same low level, as a norm, which is all wrong. There is a different norm in the Communist Party.

The norm in the Communist Party is one of total dedication for the people who come in. They expect to have to be dedicated right from the very start when they make the decision to join the Party.

This is tremendously important, I think, because you get off on the right foot, as it were, right at the very start. Then it is up to the Party to maintain it. So they come in expecting to have to sacrifice, sacrifice their time, their energy, themselves. They do not have any illusions. It does not matter if someone is joining the P.K.I., the Communist Party of Indonesia, who sees Indonesian leaders living in the Kampongs with the people, living simple lives although they are leading one of the largest parties in the world, or whether they are joining the Communist Party of the United States where they see the leaders of the Party going in and out of jail. They know that sacrifice is going to be demanded of them.

Expect Action and Sacrifice

They know also that they will have to go into action.

If you become a Catholic, the whole of your leisure hours might remain pretty much the same as before, except that you may get up a little bit earlier on Sunday morning to go to Mass. But no one would suppose, joining the Com-

munist Party, that life was going to be the same. Because they have seen the communists in action. That is the way they have come. And they know that the people they have been attracted to are out night after night, busy with their Communism, busy at work pushing their Communism there, Communists all of the time, so they come expecting to go into action.

This holds them back for some time. They have to make a decision. It is going to be a big decision. When they make it, they feel it is a most important decision and it is drawing on something noble within themselves. I do not think we should have any doubts about that at all.

I have had plenty of Communists I have helped out of the Communist Party say to me: "When I joined the Communist Party—even though you have now demonstrated that Communism is evil—I still believe it was the biggest and best decision I made in my life. It was the most unselfish decision I ever made". I have had plenty of people say that to me. They are conscious of the size of the decision they make.

So they come, expecting to have to sacrifice and they come expecting to have to go into action. They are conditioned right from the start for these things. You can see, therefore, that this business of getting as much as possible from them is, as it were, a follow-up operation. It is not something that has to be created after a period of being a Communist and doing nothing. Right from the very start, the Party expects the recruit to be dedicated and active.

Public Activity

How does the Party follow-through? In this way: There is a sort of chronological order of things which is quite important. Any Communist who has been trained in this sort of work would tell you that you cannot miss one single step on the way. The whole thing follows in a sort of logical sequence. They are not instructed straight away. They are instructed very soon but not straight away. You do not need me to tell you there are a great many differences between becoming a Catholic and becoming

a Communist. One is that if you join the Communist Party, you are received first and instructed afterwards. There are reasons for this. When recruits join the Communist Party, that is a significant act in itself; it commits them. Then they are further committed.

Quite consciously and deliberately, before they are instructed, they are sent into some sort of activity which will commit them publicly to Communism. Just how publicly would depend upon the nature of their work, etc. Obviously, if a man is a nuclear physicist and he comes to join the Communist Party, he is not going to be publicly exposed as a Communist.

The ordinary person who has no particular security reason for not being brought out in public is deliberately involved in some very public form of activity as quickly as possible. Most probably they are sent out to sell communist papers.

You may say that is a very simple thing, a low form of activity. I want to suggest to you it is of profound psychological significance.

Significant Act

I sold communist papers at the side of the road when I was a Communist; and I have sold Catholic papers at the side of the road since I have been a Catholic. I hated it either way. Only someone who has done it will understand what I mean. Perhaps you have got to be an inhibited Englishman really to suffer. You start out with a pile of papers. You unwrap them, feeling very self-conscious. The public is going by wondering what you are going to produce from your parcel. You hold up your paper, you try to bring yourself to shout *Daily Worker* and the first time it sounds like a squeak and not like your voice at all. I think it is true of anyone who is newly come to Communism. Here is an act of tremendous significance. He is making a public witness for the new thing which he has accepted. He may feel a fool as he does it, but he begins to see the significance of it when he has been there for a little while. People pass by for a while. He begins to get some dirty looks and someone

comes along and starts abusing him. It can happen to someone selling Catholic papers, too. It may be a crank, it may be a bigot but whoever it may be, someone will come along and start abusing him. This will make him draw upon his resources quite a lot. This in an act of moral courage. It is good to start a career with an act of moral courage. Sooner or later, too, someone who is not just an abusive critic but an intelligent critic comes along and starts to ask questions: Why did you join the Communist Party? How can you join the Communist Party when you know what Russia did in Hungary? Or, how Joe Stalin concluded a pact with Hitler? Someone else comes along and says: How can you be an atheist? And starts to argue atheism with him. This is tremendously important because he has not got the answers. He is not supposed to have answers at that stage. This is all part of the operation.

Discovery of Inadequacy

He discovers his own inadequacy. He thought he knew quite a lot about Communism. He had been mixing with Communists, reading the Daily Worker, perhaps, he discovers that he does not really know as much about Communism as he thought. When he has been doing this for two or three weeks, someone described as the education secretary comes to him at a Communist Party local meeting, and says: "Don't you think you ought to learn more about the Communism which you have accepted? Wouldn't you like to attend some classes? We are organising some classes for beginners now. We won't make enormous demands upon you—they will be pretty simple, geared to the state that you have reached but we'd like you to attend".

He heaves a sigh of relief, and says: "Thank God or whatever gods there may be. Here is a chance of getting the answers to the questions I have been asked. Here is a possibility of getting ammunition, shot and shell, for the battle in which I am already involved".

In other words, he already feels the need for this—and so it meets a need.

This means in turn that he goes to the classes in a receptive frame of mind. It means that he feels the tutor has something which he needs, urgently needs, desperately needs, and, therefore, he is going to pay attention to what he is given, he is going to put in whatever work is required. Incidentally no very great demands will be made on him at the start in the way of reading. All this is a sort of psychological preparation for future training.

This business of sending them out to make a public witness is something which is tremendously important. It is important in the preparation for leadership, in making them into active members. It is important, too, even in holding them to their cause.

What We Do

I remember last year when I was travelling in Central Africa, an Irish Jesuit was driving me through the bush to Lusaka, the capital of Northern Rhodesia.

As we drove into Lusaka, there were Africans spaced out about 100 yards apart on either side of the road for a very long way. They were selling something and I looked to see what it was. It was *Watch Tower*. They were Jehovah Witnesses. Those of you who know Southern Africa will know that the Jehovah Witnesses are spreading more rapidly than we are in many parts of Africa to-day.

I said, "Who are these people?"

He said, "They are Jehovah Witnesses."

I said, "Yes, I know that but what were they before they became Jehovah Witnesses?"

He said, "You really want to know?"

I said, "I wouldn't ask you otherwise."

He said, "A very high proportion of them were our people, they are baptized Catholics. They are now Jehovah Witnesses."

I said, "Well, Father, when they were ours, did we give them anything to do? Did we ever send them out to line the road, selling papers?"

He said, "I am afraid we did not. That is probably one reason why they are there now."

It was not a question of whether they were going to sell many copies of *Watch Tower*; they probably did not, but they were making a public witness—they were being made to feel that they were doing something. They had never been asked to do anything before which would bring them out in that way. I believe that this thing is significant in many ways. I do not mean that you have to send every convert you get straight out selling a Catholic paper. But to commit people publicly, make them right away start to do something which involves an act of moral courage, which brings them before others, brings them under attack, is a good thing, not a bad.

Then comes the instruction. I am trying to show you step by step the mechanics of the thing. You are a recruit to Communism. You have been asked to attend classes. Here you will learn elementary Communism. You will begin right at the very beginning. What form does the instruction take? The actual form of the instruction, the whole approach, is just as important as anything else I have described to you.

Application of Instruction

You will be made to feel right at the very start that instruction is not an end in itself; that acquiring knowledge is not an end in itself; to acquire knowledge in a world involved in a great battle is to be given as ammunition for a fight, something to be used; not just something to be absorbed.

It is a fact that people who attend communist courses generally see those courses through. It is normal for the vast majority to finish the course. Those who drop out usually have very good reasons for doing so. Now those of you who organise courses in the Church's social teachings—I wonder if you can say the same of your courses—that the majority of those who start off with great enthusiasm are still there at the last class.

When I first became a Catholic, and it has continued since, people came to me and asked me if I would launch classes. Their approach was usually this: they would ask

me to give a talk and the expectation was that a large number of people would come to hear me. At the end of my talk, the chairman would say that this was really the beginning of a series of classes, the classes would begin next week with such and such a tutor. They would try to get as many from the audience as possible to attend those classes. I was the bait, as it were.

One day when I had been doing this, a woman came to me and said, "You know, Mr. Hyde, I do not know how many times I have heard you talk. I think I have been to every lecture you have given in the greater London area.

I said, "Well, you have been very active in following me around."

She said, "I am a very active member of the Catholic Social Guild. I have been, I think, to every series of classes they have organised within reach of my home since it was founded. I have been to all their summer schools at Oxford, every year and I have been doing this since it started."

I said, "You must know a great deal about Catholic social teaching by now."

She said, "I do, Mr Hyde."

I said, "What have you done about applying it to the society in which you live?"

She said, "Good heavens, Mr. Hyde, I have been much too busy going to classes to be able to do anything like that." She is an extreme case but you know the type.

We are not achieving very much if that is all we are doing. The Communist Party would not bother to run classes if that is all it added up to. They want to instruct people in order to involve them in battle and so they have given a lot of attention to the methods which they use in the whole approach of the tutor.

Inspired Presentation

The approach of the tutor is important. You cannot convey to your pupils what you have not got. The way in which the whole thing is presented is very important

indeed. You may have all your facts right, you may know everything which you want to convey to the others, but it will not be meaningful and dynamic in their lives unless you present it in the right way.

I will tell you how the Communists do it; you can judge for yourselves whether it is capable of application, whether it is meaningful to you.

The Communists will say that it does not matter how dull the subject may be, *it has to be presented in an inspirational way*. That calls for thought, it calls for ingenuity. I will tell you how it works in practice.

The man who has joined the Communist Party, whose case we have been tracing, goes to a class. It is a beginner's class. Here is the syllabus which he will take; it is in red type appropriately called "A course for new members". It is a four-lesson course in elementary, scientific socialism. It is not simple stuff although it is made as simple as possible. It is not naturally easy; here are the titles given to the four classes:

1. What kind of world we live in
2. How that world can be changed
3. The force that can change it
4. The party of the working class.

That is the four-lesson course which a beginner does. Right at the start, he begins to learn communist theory. He believes that this is something which is related to changing the world, that the Communist Party is going to change it, and he is taught how to be one of those who will be in on the operation.

After that he gets a straight course in Scientific Socialism in simple terms, but nonetheless into the very roots of Marxism. That is the inspirational approach. For myself, I feel it has something for us.

A Great Battle

Next it is presented in *global terms*. If the Communist Party member goes to classes or if he goes to a meeting of his local Communist Party, what is presented to him will be presented against a background of the *world as it is*.

He will be made to feel there is a great battle going on all over the world, that this applies to his own country, his own locality, his own neighbourhood, to him. He will be made to feel that the period of history in which he lives is a decisive period and he has a decisive role to play in it. He is made to feel that he is a part of a *great world-wide movement*.

There is something tragic about this, of course. We talk about the Mystical Body of Christ. A Communist joins the Communist Party and is given a great sense of oneness with suffering humanity all over the world as soon as he starts attending his first classes.

If you ask me what sense of deprivation I had when I left the Communist Party and became a Catholic—and every convert has that sense of deprivation in some form or another—I think I would say it would be the loss of *that sense of oneness* which we had in the Communist Party. That is crazy, of course, it is we who talk about the Mystical Body of Christ. But this is a hard reality, it is a hard fact of life.

The Communist is made to feel this sense of oneness right at the start. We know that men do respond tremendously to this feeling of being united with others throughout the world and it has never been more true than of our generation. No generation has ever had the means of being one with men throughout the world as our generation has. Then what is taught is linked with *action*. This is tremendously important. You know as well as I do, if we are honest with ourselves, that we have classes in Catholic social teaching running for year after year, where we have people talking about man's inalienable human rights. They rattle this off; it is almost meaningless; they can still be talking about and learning about man's inalienable human rights even while still continuing their own racial prejudices, colour prejudices, class prejudices, snobbery and all the rest of it.

Related to Life

It does not connect up with life. Something fails to click. They learn it, but it does not influence their lives.

If the instruction is linked with action from the start, this is meaningful to their lives. It is not just something which goes into their head and stops there. The way the Party tries to insure that this should be so is as follows:

Any tutor worth his salt in the Communist Party finishes each class with these words: "What are the comrades going to do about what they have learned tonight? How are you going to apply what you have learned to the hospital where you are nursing? You to the school where you are teaching? You to the factory where you are employed? You as a housewife to the neighbourhood where you are living?"

The first item on the agenda next week will be "How did the comrades apply what they learned last week?" It does not matter whether it is dialectical materialism or trade union history or scientific Socialism or what the cause may be. The course will be related to life and action in that way.

Next, in addition to being linked with action, the tutor sets out to make the individual feel that he has a role in this activity, that *he* has to go into action and that he has an important part to play.

Finally, it is presented in such a way as to make him feel that he is engaged in a fight which is against evil things and for the good. You may say that that is an extraordinary inversion. You see Communism as evil; we see ourselves as standing for the good. But do not have any illusions about this. The Communist sees *us* as evil; he sees the things we hold as evil; he believes that the Communism he has got is the best thing that any man could ever have. He sees himself as involved in a fight against evil things; an evil capitalist system, an evil system which condemns millions of people to early death through preventable social diseases, which kills off millions of children all over the world through chronic malnutrition, which keeps people in ignorance and subjection. He is on the side of righteousness—or believes he is.

Fighting Evil Things

Here is an extraordinary thing that you can have an

atheist tutor appealing to people in this way, making them feel they are on the side of righteousness and yet often we are inhibited about doing it. This is quite an extraordinary thing, but it is real and, of course, in doing this they are working on something very profound indeed. They do draw out something good in their people and they use what is good for an evil cause.

They are able to get people to respond because they make them feel that they are part of a crusade, that they are fighting evil things, that they are on the side of righteousness. I believe that the response can be gotten by others.

I recently did a survey of *Marxism Today*, one of the communists' learned journals, for the past two years and I estimated that slightly more than fifty per cent of its space had been devoted—not to economic condemnation of our society but to a *moral condemnation* of our society, to discussion of moral aspects of life in a decadent society.

The Communists know that Communism has both an economic appeal and an ethical appeal and that the ethical appeal will be the greater one. Any man who has ever led a strike knows perfectly well that when the strike is going badly and the fight is getting hard and tough, if you really want to maintain the morale of your people, you stop talking about so many cents an hour extra pay or whatever it may be. You get off the economic issue and you say that there is a tremendous principle at stake. If you appeal to them in that way you will get their support; and you will get a degree of sacrifice which you otherwise would not have.

The Communists know this and they use it for their own purposes. Often I feel that some of our people look almost with suspicion on moral indignation. It is a healthy thing; it is not unhealthy. The communists are able to build up this moral indignation against the evils of our times and use it for their own purposes. The recruit to Communism goes through a course in this way and all the time is shown the wider issues and how what is being taught is related to these broader issues.

The study group is where the leaders are formed and not

just by leadership techniques as such. A great deal depends on the attitude of the tutor, the way in which the tutor approaches his or her particular job.

One Man's Story

Let me give you the story of one man who came to the Communist Party and how we made a leader of him. You will note the stages in his development and the steps which the Communists believe are required in the formation of a leader through instruction.

I had been giving a leadership course. I was the tutor. When I came to the last session, I ended it by saying what the Communists the world over say: "The Communist Party is able to take anyone who is willing to be trained in leadership and turn him into a leader". I will repeat that because the communists believe it. *The Communist Party is able to take anyone who is willing to be trained in leadership and turn him into a leader.*

You note the one qualification—if he is willing to be trained. That pre-supposes an attitude of mind which communist parties have to try to create.

I closed my series with those words; I got down from the platform. A new recruit who was doing the course came to me and said that he wanted to be made into a leader. He did not say it like that. It was not as simple as that. As I looked at him, I thought I had never seen anyone look less like a leader in my life. He was short, grotesquely fat, with a great, flabby, wide uninteresting face, as unprepossessing a man as you will find anywhere. He had a cast in one eye, and the poor man had a most distressing stutter too, and so quite literally he said to me—I am not making fun of the man—"C-c-comrade, I w-w-want you t-t-to t-t-take me and t-t-train me and t-t-to t-t-turn me i-i-into a l-l-leader of m-men". I wondered how I was going to do it. I wondered why we had made that big claim of being able to take anyone who was willing.

Here was Jim, pathetically willing, but how were we going to do it? I thought, this is a challenge, and so I told

him: "If you come to our classes, Jim, you will have to study. You will learn dialectical and historical materialism. From that you will learn that the very laws of the universe are on the side of Communism. The law of change, progress coming through conflict is something which we use, which helps us, which guarantees our ultimate victory provided that we understand our Communism sufficiently well.

"You will see that there has been a pattern in history—running through history over the years, building up to the ultimate triumph of Communism. We shall only succeed in our aim if a sufficient number of people are trained in leadership, understand the moment of opportunity and seize it when it comes".

Set a Task

I gave him a hope; I gave him a goal. I gave him something to work towards, and I set out to give him confidence in himself. That is the first step on the way to making a man a leader. You must give him self-confidence.

That in itself is not enough. The world is full of people who are bursting with self-confidence and have nothing to back it up. They are not leaders. They are just nuisances. So the next thing was, of course, to give him something to be confident about. In other words, we gave him his instruction; we gave him something which others had not got. When he had been going to classes some eight or nine months, I went to him one night and I said, "You know, Jim, you ought to be a tutor".

He was absolutely terrified.

I said, "You have been in the Party now for some time. You have been attending classes for eight or nine months. Have you learned anything?"

He said, "Yes, I have learned a lot".

I said, "Well, you know, the majority of people who join the Communist Party know as little as you did when you joined. In other words they know practically nothing about our theories. Now if you have already learned a lot, this means that you know more than the people who have just joined".

He said, "Yes".

I said, "The whole art of teaching is to know just a little bit more than the people you are teaching—if you do, you can get away with it. If people ask you questions and you do not know the answers, all right, go to your text book. Say, I do not know the answer, but I will give it to you next week. Go to the textbook. Find it there. In that way you will learn. If you cannot find it there, I will give it to you".

And so I made him feel that he was adequate to the task. And he was.

I did not send him as a building worker with a minimum of education to teach dialectical materialism to nuclear physicists. I taught him to take a beginners' class for building workers, like himself. This was a tremendous thing in his training as a leader, because here was a new relationship between himself and his fellow workers. They were sitting at his feet at night. He was teaching them what he knew. This was good for his confidence. And in order to do it, he had to think out what we had taught him. He had to get some order into his thinking, some discipline into his thought, which the average man does not have to do. He had to learn to get the ideas, which we put into his head, out of his head and into the head of the other person. In other words, he had to become articulate. We gave him a clear goal towards which to work. We made him see his role in the wider fight, and, of course, we sent him into action.

Those were important steps in his formation as a leader; ones worth noting and trying to follow, I think. At any rate in due course, I asked him if he would go through a public speaking course. He went. It is a course pretty much the same as the course which Frank Sheed would give to members of the Catholic Evidence Guild.

Twenty Years Later

Then we put him at the street corner, in the market place. We did not turn him into a great orator. We did not even cure him of his stutter, which became modified as

he gained confidence in himself. But he was still agitating for Communism and propagandizing twenty years later.

Having given him—and this is an essential part in training a leader—the broader training in leadership, we told him that he must lead in a specialized field, and this is important too. We did not throw him to the wolves and say: “all right, you go into your labour union and start leading there”. We gave him six months preparation. We taught him trade union history, trade union procedure, how to chair a meeting, how to move a resolution, how to move an addendum. We taught him the vocabulary of the labour movement so when he got up he would not sound like some sort of alien. The average Catholic in the labour union only gets up and speaks when the question of birth control, or Catholic schools, or something like that comes up. We equipped him to talk the ordinary language of the ordinary trade unionist, to know his interests, to be able to speak about those interests, not to appear to be grinding a communist axe, but as a good trade unionist.

Until recently, Britain had just one communist-dominated union, the Electrical Trades Union, and Jim was one of its leaders. I assure you, you are never likely to have a more unpromising pupil than Jim. The Communist Party turned him into a leader. He is still doing an effective job of leadership for it now.

It is an extraordinary paradox that we say that Communism is opposed to the individual, and that we are the great defenders of the individual. In practice, the Communist Party does certainly bring out the potentialities of its people where often we neglect them. I think we ought to have greater faith in the human material that God puts in our hands.

A Radical Infirmary

“There is, by the essential fundamental constitution of things, a radical infirmity in all human contrivances . . .”—Edmund Burke.

Book Review

A COMMUNIST IS BORN

Cuba, Church and Crisis by Leslie Dewart; Sheed and Ward; pp. 320; 15s.

A LITTLE over three years ago, I published a study of Castro's Cuba in the issue of *Christian Order* for December, 1961. My analysis contained defects, but I believed at the time and have continued to believe since that it was correct in emphasizing one point of great importance. I refer to the pragmatic nature of Castro's Communism. In my analysis of the Cuban Revolution I wrote, "By such as Castro, Communism is chosen primarily on pragmatic grounds, as a system rather than an ideology; for the possibility offered of completing a revolution as distinct from the attractiveness in itself of the Communist dialectic".

This belief of mine has been reinforced by a careful reading of Leslie Dewart's, *Cuba, Church and Crisis*. On page thirty-three he writes, "The point is that Castro adopted Communism pragmatically — this is one reason why it was not fated beforehand. But to say 'pragmatically' is not to say half-heartedly or with reservations; Castro adopted Marxism-Leninism sincerely and systematically, though to judge by his public utterances with only little more than a cursory acquaintance with its theoretical points and thus he continues in character even in this respect. For to Castro questions of detail have never been more problematic than those about the correctness of otherwise effective means; all he seems to care to debate is their efficiency . . . Castro did not adopt Communism because he became convinced of its truth in the first place, a truth which he then sought to implement. On the contrary, having found it convenient and, more than convenient, practical, to apply Communism, he became sincerely persuaded of its truth".

In other words, Castro ended by becoming the thing he

first adopted as an instrument for the consummation in the social field of his revolutionary ambition. How deliberately he adopted Communism; to what extent his choice was obscured by outside pressures—these are points that leave room for discussion. One thing, however, seems abundantly clear from a careful reading of this excellent book. Communism did not steal Cuba by stealth. Castro chose it in the first place as the best—perhaps, in his eyes, the only—available instrument of effective social reform. He was shrewd enough to see that his military victory over Batista and its political consequences constituted only a beginning, that his revolution could not be left hanging in the air. He had to press on into the social field; take his revolution, if you like, into the very guts of Cuban society. The system provided by Communism offered him the best means of doing this in record time. That, precisely, is why he chose it.

Castro was helped undoubtedly to do this by the foolishness of United States diplomacy, geared too closely to old Latin-American attitudes, thinking too easily in terms of the Guatemala solution of some years before. Overall was the apparent determination to maintain the economic status quo, to see Cuba continue as a place that lived by grace of American capital and took dollars from American tourists. Rightly or wrongly Cubans were left with the impression that American business interests resented their aspirations in the direction of economic independence, which they sought as a mark of their dignity as a people; that Americans were determined to see their island remain as a colonial fief, in all but name, of the United States. Throughout the early months of the Revolution there was the inclination as well of a significant section of the American Press to take a simpliste view of Castro's Revolution, to score as Communist-motivated the bombast that was inspired largely by a desire to set relationships with other nations on a basis of equality. All this was recognised too late. One might almost say that Castro thrust a Communist framework on Cuba not only to complete his revolution, but to spite the United States. By so doing,

he achieved an independence which bore witness to the dignity of himself and his people. The lesson to be drawn is capable of wide application throughout the developing world.

It was not only the United States that failed in its first dealings with the Cuban Revolution. The Church failed as well. It did so because its concern was only with the preservation of itself within a social and political order regarded as irremediable. When the Revolution came to Cuba the Church was lost, bereft of the mental agility to understand, still less assist or guide its initial efforts in the field of social reform. "The Church", writes the Author, himself a devout Catholic, "did not plan for change, but for stability; when revolution finally came, it was the last thing the hierarchy was prepared for. All it sought was survival. In this attitude, lay the root cause of the Church's failure to cope with the Revolution". Again, "The greatest trial of the Cuban Church as the first half of the twentieth century was drawing to a close was caused not so much by its truly pitiful condition, or by the dimness of its prospects, or by the mountainous height of its immemorial problems, but by its pedestrian and natural desire above all to survive the perils of the times. It is difficult to take risks, as sometimes one must, or to take them wisely, when concern for security is dominant".

The judgment is devastating but true. It could be made, I am afraid, of the Church in other countries as well. I know some in Africa now where it fits exactly. The quotation that follows applies beyond Cuba and does much to explain the Church's failure to work intelligently with social revolutions that follow everywhere in the wake of independence. It deserves to be read and meditated on again and again and again: "The Cuban Church's pride was nurtured not by luxury, but by poverty, and not by great popular success, but by great popular indifference. It felt so harrassed, so imperilled, that it thought it could do nothing except trust in Christ's promises. It thought of itself as a monument whose function was to stand still—patient, holy, and untouched by time and space—a testimony to the

power of God. The disassociation of the Christian and the Secular order, though far from complete, was severe enough to make it difficult for the hierarchy and clergy to understand how any society but a medieval, sacral one could be Christian. It became easy, therefore, to think that to be a Christian was the same as to withdraw from the world's sullyng contact. This gave the Church a tactical inflexibility which ultimately led to its eclipse.

"The Cuban Church seems to have thought that, having been rejected by its world, it needed no longer to live in it, as if the Word Himself, because He was God, had not chosen to become man and sanctify the world by sharing the world, by sharing bread, wine, water, with mankind. To the same degree that it mistook itself, it also misunderstood the nature of the sociopolitical events around it: it failed to see that the problem was not simply one of Communism but of the beginnings of Cuba's emergence from medieval life, with all the painful dislocation due to the process of rapid, violent, overdue, historical change. Not even success would have justified attacking this process head on. Orthodoxy was saved, but little else; fortunately without any deep wounds in the flesh. There remains a faint hope that within the Cuban Church the idea that tolerance does not mean surrender might yet one day be born".

Nowhere is the need for John's *aggiornamento* more apparent than when one surveys with sadness the long list of opportunities lost everywhere throughout the developing countries today. Those who feel this loss and want to do something about it could do no better than buy this book and pass it on to others. Its chapters on Cuba are brilliantly done. They deserve study and meditation, especially with regard to their wider application. The same can be said of those which deal directly with the Church and the modern world. There are valuable lessons to be drawn from this most important book. What one looks for today in the Church is a willingness to draw them. It is not yet in sufficient evidence.

Paul Crane, S.J.

SCOOP

Father Paul Crane writes:

Douglas Hyde's name has long been a by-word throughout the developing countries of the world. It is quite typical that, when I phoned him the other day, I found myself talking to a man who had just that moment got back from Malaysia. It is typical also that, on this occasion, he should have granted, at once and so generously, the request I put to him.

It came about in this fashion. I had read with growing excitement a series of eight lectures which he gave, in the summer of 1962, to a gathering of missionaries specially convened for the occasion in the United States. In them, Hyde examined the ingredients of the communist dynamic and compared it with our own; what, in other words, makes Communists tick and Christians falter.

The comparison goes against us. Hence the question, can we take what is good from the communist dynamic and apply it to ourselves? I found Hyde's answer fascinating and of immense value; so much so that I determined to seek his permission to print his lectures as a series in *Christian Order*. I was on the phone to him for this reason. He granted my request at once. The series began last month. Its publication represents something of a scoop.

I do not see how anyone can afford to neglect Hyde's penetrating analysis. We all have to learn the lesson it contains, particularly those at work in the developing countries. Readers of *Christian Order* are asked to cash in on the opportunity presented by this wonderful series and to do all they can to make the magazine more widely known. The price of 12 issues of *Christian Order* is 15s. in England and \$3.00 in the United States. Send subscriptions, please, to the Editor at 65 Belgrave Road, London, S.W.1.

**POPE
JOHN
XXIII** **Journal
of a
soul**

**FOURTH printing
already ordered**

The only diaries of a pope ever published.

42/-

MICHAEL FOGARTY

**■ under-governed and
over-governed**

'This admirable and luminous book points the way to the "educational state." Its challenging call . . . accords with Christian social tenets.' Catholic Herald.

6/-

YVES CONGAR, O.P.

**■ power and poverty
in the church**

The Church must be seen to be poor and at the service of mankind. Congar reveals the scriptural and theological motives for his belief.

15/-

CARDINAL CARDIJN

■ laymen into action

One of the pioneers of the lay apostolate, Cardijn explains his conception of the person, his sense of mission, his hopes for the future.

16/-

among other authors we publish are:

PAUL VI, GAUTHIER, LEO TRESE

**geoffrey chapman ltd
18 high st wimbledon london SW19**